



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,063	11/24/2003	Srinivasan N. Rao	14846-32	3266

7590 06/18/2007
GEORGE MORGAN
LOWENSTEIN SANDLER, PC
65 LIVINGSTON AVENUE
ROSELAND, NJ 07068

EXAMINER

BROWN, CHRISTOPHER J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/18/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/721,063

Applicant(s)

RAO ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher J. Brown

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/24/03.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 11/24/03 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because some of the NPL documents do not have dates listed. At least the year of the NPL document must be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saare US 2005/0015490 in view of Yabe US 2006/0015559

As per claim 1, 8, and 15, Saare teaches a single sign-on authentication system, comprising: an authentication component that determines whether a user is authenticated, (single sign on adapter implementing authentication mechanisms) [0014], [0016] Saare teaches if it is determined that the user is authenticated, the authentication component generates a connection request (user can request a resource after initial sign on) [0033] [0034]. Saare teaches an interface component that receives the connection request from the authentication component, the connection request including an identifier (sign on mechanism for resource servers receive identifiers and or passwords from portal server) [0035]. Saare teaches the interface component compares the received identifier with an expected identifier and, if they match, allowing access (signing on using an ID and password) [0041].

Saare does not teach including entitlement information with identification information. Saare does not teach making the entitlement information available to a server associated with the interface component.

Yabe teaches including entitlement information in the request to the server (Mail ID) [0093], Fig 13.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the entitlement information of Yabe in the request of Saare so that the server could retrieve desired user information.

As per claims 2, and 9 Saare teaches information used to authenticate a user (user identifier and password) [0017]. Saare does not teach entitlement information.

Yabe teaches entitlement information is an different from information used to authenticate the user (Mail ID).

As per claims 4 and 11 Saare teaches the single sign-on authentication system of claim 2, wherein the authentication component determines the entitlement information based on the information used to authenticate the user.

As per claims 5, and 12 Saare teaches the information used to authenticate the user includes one or more of a user identifier and a password [0017].

As per claims 6 and 13, Yabe teaches the entitlement information is contained in a header portion of a data packet (the Mail ID in the HTTP header) [0094] Fig 13.

As per claims 7 and 14, Yabe teaches the connection request is sent as an HTTP request (HTTP GET request) [0094] Fig 13.

Art Unit: 2134

Claims 3, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saare US 2005/0015490 in view of Yabe US 2006/0015559 in view of Song US 2005/0066037.

As per claims 3, and 10 the previous Saare-Yabe combination does not teach that the identifier is an IP address.

Song teaches that an identifier may be an IP address, [0061].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the identifier IP address of Song with the single sign on system of Saare-Yabe because the IP address allows the authenticator to perform additional authentication algorithms, thus making the system more secure.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher J. Brown whose telephone number is (571)272-3833. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on (571)272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2134

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Christopher Brown

6/5/07

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Christopher J. Brown". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large initial "C".